

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

May 16, 2018

**TO:** Environmental Justice Commissioner Group Meeting

**FROM:** Clesi Bennett, Coastal Planner (415/352-3613; clesi.bennett@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Shannon Fiala, Planning Manager (415/352-3665; shannon.fiala@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Steve Goldbeck, Chief Deputy Director (415/352-3611; steve.goldbeck@bcdc.ca.gov)

**SUBJECT: Draft Meeting Summary of May 3, 2018, Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting**

1. **Roll Call, Introductions, and Approval of Agenda.** The meeting was called to order at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Claremont Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at 11:14 a.m. Working Group members in attendance included Commissioner Sheri Pemberton (via teleconference) and Commissioner Pat Showalter. Staff in attendance included, Chief Deputy Director Steve Goldbeck, Planning Manager Shannon Fiala, Planner Clesi Bennett, Permit Analyst Walt Deppe, Planner Elizabeth Felter, Chief of Enforcement Adrienne Klein, Permit Analyst Hanna Miller, and Enforcement Analyst Matthew Trujillo

2. **Approval of the April 5, 2018 Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group meeting Summary.** Approval of the summary was tabled until the next meeting because of lack of quorum.

3. **Environmental Justice and Social Equity Bay Plan Amendment Timeline Update.** Planner Clesi Bennett presented that at the last meeting our Commissioners asked if we could check in at each of these meetings to see if we are still on schedule since we have a quick timeline to try to get everything done by November. Based what we had laid out last meeting we are on schedule. We are still doing background research and doing some relationship building and reaching out to different organizations as well as crafting our public engagement strategy.

Planning Manager Shannon Fiala added: We are looking forward to going to the next phase and having conversations with organizations that are working on environmental justice policy development.

4. **Presentation and Discussion on Definitions Relevant to the Environmental Justice Bay Plan Amendment.** Ms. Bennett continued: I am going to combine some of the background research; the definitions and our engagement analysis together because they all dovetail off of each other.

**ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMISSIONER GROUP SUMMARY**  
**May 3, 2018**

As a reminder - our project goal with this amendment is to, "Amend the San Francisco Bay Plan to incorporate principles of environmental justice and social equity into the planning, design, and permitting of shoreline projects in and along the San Francisco Bay."

At our last meeting everyone seemed to agree with our stated goal. I will dive into some of the definitions of the words used in our stated goal. We will get to this later in our meeting but first I would like to share with you some of the work we are doing around our analysis of other state and regional agencies.

As I mentioned last time we had been starting to have some calls and some meetings with some of our sister agencies and then we continued to do a deeper dive and look at what is really happening around the state. BCDC is one of many agencies who are embarking on this integration of equity or environmental justice into various aspects of their agencies. There is a multitude of different ways that agencies are incorporating these principles. Some agencies are developing screening tools or ways to analyze equity going forward. Other agencies are looking more inward maybe at their workplace practices or their hiring practices. Some agencies have dedicated a staff person or a commissioner or board member from some of these communities to work on this issue. There is a multitude of different options that BCDC has going forward; the Bay Plan being one of them.

We do have a directive from the Natural Resources Agency that does ask its boards and commissions to consider environmental justice in its work. We are attempting to fulfill that.

There are many different ways that this work could take place at BCDC including this Bay Plan Amendment but through this process we might also realize that there are other changes we may want to make internally with our communications and regulations.

We had some questions for discussion regarding the memo that was sent out about interagency coordination and initiatives:

1. How do you see BCDC fitting into this EJ movement around the region or the state?
2. Are there any coordination opportunities?
3. Are there any other initiatives that were not included in the memo that was sent out?

Commissioner Showalter commented: In my experience one of the problems with getting lower-economic, prosperity communities to engage is that people are working. It is really, really helpful if you can provide some sort of stipend for their engagement. I did not read anywhere that was part of it. It doesn't necessarily have to be a great deal of money. There was mention in one of these of child care and food and those sorts of things make a really big difference in getting engagement.

In addition to that if somebody is paid a little money to do something they often feel a great deal of responsibility to communicate back to the group that they are representing which isn't always the case. So that can be a big benefit to the organization that is doing the outreach in addition to the fact that it gets the person there.

I would just say that we might want to think about some stipends.

Ms. Bennet replied: Yes. I think that is something that when we get to the engagement part we hope to talk about. On to the definitions. Last time when we met we decided that we wanted to take a deeper dive into what does environmental justice, social equity and the identified communities actually mean for BCDC. I did some research about what other agencies are using, how this is defined in the state code, what terms other organizations are using and that is what you will see reflected in the memo.

The big thing that came out of this research is trying to strike a balance between something that is broad and something that is narrow and understanding which of those may be restrictive, what is going to be so broad that it won't actually help us. That is the lens that I was viewing these definitions through. Also something to think about is what role should the communities play in defining these terms. We are using these terms to create policy that will ideally benefit them.

It may be worth it to keep these terms and definitions flexible and open as we go through our public engagement process in getting the opinions of community members and community-based organizations on how they feel that these terms should be identified.

Our starting point was the California Government Code definition which has been around since 1999 and defines environmental justice as:

"The fair treatment of all races, cultures and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies."

So this was the definition that we had talked about last meeting and there was some concern that this was too large of a lift for BCDC to undertake. After reviewing many of the other agencies that are working on this I found that almost every agency has taken on this definition or is using this definition in some way. We would retain that consistency if we were to stick with this definition. It is broad enough that it would allow us some flexibility in how we would want to implement it.

However, it may be too broad that there isn't a direct, actionable way to implement it. So that is something to think about. This definition came from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's definition. In the national definition it talks about the meaningful involvement of these communities and people of all races, cultures and incomes in the creation of these laws. We could think about including this if we wanted to do a BCDC-specific one.

Also, does this definition go far enough? Is fair treatment really what we want to be saying or do we want to call out the fact that there has been historical and still-current disproportional burdens and benefits on certain communities in understanding that this has a historical context.

So we came up with a potential starting place of what a BCDC-specific definition would look like. Here is one example:

“The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of people of all races, cultures and incomes with respect to the implementation and enforcement of the McAteer-Petris Act, Suisun Marsh Preservation Act, the San Francisco Bay Plan and amendment process, BCDC Regulations, BCDC Permit Process including the Design Review Board and Engineering Criteria Review Board and Adapting to Rising Tides Program as well as the development of BCDC’s Strategic Plan”

So this would require that we address this at each of our action points. This is one option or starting point of how we could define environmental justice specifically for BCDC. However, we may decide as this issue morphs and solutions change that this could be restrictive or outdated or not allow analysts the discretion to implement it in the best way possible.

We may also want to use stronger language than just the fair treatment; we may want to call out historical and current inequities. These are all possible tweaks that we could make to a definition of environmental justice or we could dive deeper into the context and into BCDC-specifics in the policy itself.

The next term that we wanted to look at was social equity. Do we want a more broad definition or do we want a more narrow definition? OPR has a lot of guidance on social equity in their new General Plan Guidelines. They view social equity as this overarching framework to guide local governments in their planning. They offer several different definitions that I have included in the memo.

The other option would be to tailor a definition of equities specifically to our work. You see that with the Department of Public Health in their defining of health equity as well as with the Safeguarding California Plan they get into the idea of climate equity and also in OPR’s climate adaptation work.

One possibility is creating the idea of “Bay Equity” for BCDC. And again, this is just a starting point but one potential definition could be that Bay equity refers to BCDC’s efforts to ensure that this and future generations have full and equal public access to San Francisco Bay and that development approved through BCDC’s permit process promotes everyone’s opportunity to participate.

We may want to consider historical context and we could strengthen this definition to call out some of the disproportional burdens and benefits of certain communities. This is just a starting place of what this could look like or similar to the last process we could get more into the specifics of how this relates to the agency in the policies rather than in these broader definitions.

Lastly, and potentially the one that has the most implications is how we define the communities that we are targeting because ultimately this will relate to the permit process. This is the definition that agencies have typically tailored to their own work.

Some currently used terms include: disadvantaged communities, vulnerable communities, communities of concern, impacted communities, environmental justice and there are a lot of different terms that we could choose.

The big split in how these terms are defined is whether they are empirical and based on quantitative data perhaps using census data that is measureable or if they are more based on qualitative data that is not measureable or a combination of both.

We thought that BCDC's ART Program with their mapping of vulnerable communities looking at different socio-economic factors as well as proximity to contaminated sites, the identification of communities in other screening criteria may be a place for us to start in crafting a definition around the communities that we are trying to target.

The ART Program is looking at vulnerability to sea level rise but if we are talking about public access or recreation or proximity to certain developments; that may be something that we also want to include in a definition. This may come out as we identify where potential policy changes are going to be. It may be a definition that changes and molds as we go through this process.

So DAC is disadvantaged communities, EDACS is economically disadvantaged communities and COC is communities of concern. Those are terms that other agencies have adopted in their identification of these communities.

We have a few questions for you regarding these definitions. Here are some questions:

- Does BCDC want to use the state definition of environmental justice or use a tailored definition or perhaps strengthen the state definition?
- Does BCDC want to view social equity as a broad frame work or use a tailored definition?
- Does BCDC want an empirical or qualitative community definition (or a mixture of both)?

What indicators should be included?

Commissioner Pemberton commented: I wanted to thank you for a comprehensive set of slides and analysis on these questions. We should start with the state definition for all the reasons that you went over. Maybe we could consider supplementing that with a more personalized explanation of the vision or sense of environmental justice and social equity.

Commissioner Showalter agreed: I ditto what Commissioner Pemberton just said. Since there is a state definition this has been a very confusing term for people. Anything we can do to reduce that confusion is a good idea.

Having an explanation associated with our definition of how this relates to BCDC's work would be good.

There isn't really a state definition for the other two things that we talked about.

Ms. Bennett replied: There are some definitions that are in the state code; not a whole lot. There is one for health equity that relates specifically to some of the programs that the Department of Public Health is undertaking. There is also a kind of definition for disadvantaged communities and these are all in the memo that was sent out that is specific to Cal EPA and CalEnviroScreen.

Commissioner Showalter continued: But I got the impression that the one that was decided on and being used by a number of people was the environmental justice one. We are more at liberty to be creative on the other terms.

I thought that your suggestion using one for social equity that is a tailored definition is good and I like that. It helps people because these are such a conceivably broad thing – I mean; we could change these three or four times during the process. To start with we would want to convey to people how this relates to BCDC right from the get-go.

I really liked your suggestions about the community definition. We have put in a lot of effort in the ART Program and the communities that are subject to sea level rise and the communities that are subject to flooding are pretty much coincident. I think that is a great starting point but there could be other things.

Permit Analyst Hanna Miller commented: My only comment on my way out is the more tailored BCDC one is good but there are so many different documents and processes that you would have to list to have it be fully comprehensive that you would kind of lose the meaning of it. This specific BCDC tailored definition is not the full list of everything that I look at as a permit analyst.

Ms. Fiala replied: We might move away from that.

Ms. Miller answered: Yes. I would support that.

Ms. Fiala had a question for Commissioner Showalter: Commissioner Showalter, coming from a local government perspective, has your community already started to talk about SB 1000 at all in terms of integrating environmental justice into your General Plan? The Governor's Office of Planning and Research is trying to help local communities with this new legislation that is requiring communities that have disadvantaged communities to incorporate EJ into their general plans.

Commissioner Showalter responded: I don't know the answer to that question. We updated our General Plan about seven years ago and I wasn't on the Council then. I know that it is something we talked about. With us, it is related to land that is being re-purposed from the industrial area and has groundwater contamination issues. That is how it has come up in our community.

When I worked at the Santa Clara Water District we were very aware that it was something that was really hard for us to deal with. In our community we had two groups that were particularly vocal and they were at opposite ends of the socio-economic scale; Palo Alto and Alviso.

It was just one of those things that we always were amazed at: where is the missing middle? These two communities were very organized and there were other communities that had many issues that for some reason or another weren't. We spent a lot of time trying to think about, particularly in the Alviso community, what had triggered their organization and involvement besides incredible flooding.

There are some other disadvantaged communities that had had flooding and had not triggered it. This is where my experience comes from than the General Plan one.

Ms. Fiala replied: I wonder for local governments around the Bay if it might be helpful to try to also provide consistency with the definition of communities under SB 1000?

Ms. Bennett continued: The way they are defining things is based on Cal EPA and CalEnviroScreen. Their environmental justice definition is the one that I put up on the screen. The community definition is the one that has to do with CalEnviroScreen which is in the memo.

Ms. Fiala added: It focuses on income rather than race.

Ms. Bennett spoke: I need to go back and check the law specifically about how they are measuring it. A lot of it is based on the data from CalEnviroScreen.

Ms. Fiala added: It looks like the legislation uses the terms environmental pollution or other hazards, but does not define them. That could be tailored to BCDC's purposes.

Ms. Bennett chimed in: The confusing part of that in the definition it points you to a different section of the code and that section of the code points you to a different of the code so it was like a three-tiered thing. I will go back and look at exactly how they define them. It may be a little convoluted for us to take that one.

Ms. Fiala added: It would also be interesting to think about a Venn diagram of what is included in the ART definition and what is included in the SB 1000 definition.

Chief of Enforcement Adrienne Klein commented: Normally in an application the only local government approval that it required to file an application is the discretionary approval. You were talking about supporting local government adoption of these changes that will be required to general plans. Would it be helpful or useful for BCDC in reviewing projects to use the local government's analysis on how a project may be impacting a community of concern? But if that general plan amendment is not in place yet and then an analysis is not occurring; BCDC could do it? I'm just trying to think of not doing the same analysis twice so that we would play that role in the absence of the local government playing that role. But if they have done it and it meets the parameters of our authority —

Ms. Bennet replied: Yes. I will look specifically at what is in the criteria and what they have to analyze when they are identifying these communities. If it is based on CalEnviroScreen's definition I know one of the issues has been for urban areas. There are communities that are left out because of the population densities.

Planner Elizabeth Felter commented: This was a big reason that the ART Program developed their own indicators.

Ms. Fiala added: So that is a reason that none of the communities in the Bay Area might have to comply with this.

Ms. Bennett re-emphasized: I will go back into that and lay out exactly how they are defining it. It was a bit convoluted. I can see if we could use their analysis and if it would be suitable for our purposes. A lot of it is air pollution and water pollution.

Ms. Fiala added: It was more focused on public health and it also includes other hazards.

Ms. Klein continued: Also thinking farther ahead we could consider a regulation change that would require a local government analysis. Is the project taking place in a disadvantaged community that meets the ART factors?

The original idea of the local, discretionary approval was so that BCDC wouldn't make a decision in conflict with the local government.

Mr. Goldbeck chimed in: It could be something in conflict because the local government could approve it then BCDC disapproves it. Part of the idea is not to have BCDC getting ahead of the local government's process and then have it come to BCDC.

Those are good things to consider. Off the top of my head I can't see a regulation to force local governments to do something like that. I do think that we should be looking at whether the local government has gone through that analysis. That really would be helpful.



Ms. Bennett continued: we will go back and do some tailoring and some edits based on what was talked about and I will definitely look into how SB 1000 is playing into this and what analysis local governments will be doing and if there is any possibility for us to coordinate or be able to work off of that as well.

Ms. Fiala commented: So what I am hearing from the Commissioners is that we should actually use the state's definition of environmental justice but then add a commitment from BCDC in terms of what that means for us.

The main thing is that we will be using the state's definition explaining how it applies to our process.

The definition of social equity needs a bit more work. Our definition of disadvantaged communities will be refined through our outreach process as we decide what exactly we are asking permit applicants to do in regards to environmental justice.

What Adrienne was getting at was whether BCDC would do the work up front to map these communities or that we would be asking permit applicants to do it for each project. There are pros and cons for both of those approaches.

Ms. Klein added: We could amend the application to solicit information to ensure that we are aware of the factors and the basic context of the project that is being reviewed.

Ms. Bennett commented: The last bit of research that we looked at was how should we go about doing a community and public engagement process. As we stated last time we want that to be a very important piece of this amendment. We have been talking to other agencies to see how they have done public engagement and if there is any coordination to be done. We have spoken to a number of agencies on how we could go forward with this.

There has been some state commitment from OPR and Natural Resources Agencies and they have both recognized that we need to improve our engagement and that it is integral to creating these policies as a lot of these local communities really know what is best. They know where the solutions are. They are the ones who are living in these areas that we are talking about.

An interesting model that the California Environmental Justice Alliance has just put out is this public participation spectrum. The idea is to move from left to right. We are hoping with whatever process we design we can have an eye on moving to the right hand side of this spectrum.

However, we do know that we've got limitations in doing this. And we know that we will have hurdles in reaching that empowerment side of that spectrum. I do not believe we have any funds set aside for stipends, food or the ability to provide child care and other services during these workshops or meetings.

Knowing that and being honest and upfront about that from the get-go is important. But we are still trying to design a process that will have robust public engagement and there are several different approaches that we hope to take.

The big theme throughout this is how can we leverage our resources with our other regional agencies, state agencies, community groups, the ART Program and also our in-house expertise of our regulatory staff.

Here you see what our engagement timeline potentially could look like. All the materials should be posted after the meetings. These meetings are open to the public and perhaps we could have a bigger push to try to invite people to these. This month we are working on developing relationships with different community organizations, having one-to-one conversations with groups that have worked on past environmental justice, policy-related issues or have worked with BCDC in the past and perhaps have been involved with different ART processes.

In the summer we want to do some workshops and surveying. And then in the fall get into the amendment process itself.

We have spent a bunch of time developing relationships with our partner agencies and trying to reduce this engagement fatigue of engaging the same organizations and the same people on the same issues over and over. So we are trying to reduce that.

Now we are trying to reach out to groups that work statewide, regionally and locally. I included a list of some of these potential organizations and also tribal entities that we hope to speak with and work with in the memo.

We have also been able to attend some community events, some Resilient by Design community events as well as we went to an Environmental Justice Task Force meeting in Bayview and we are going to be distributing the flyer that is in your packet at the Air District's AB 617 workshops where they are doing monitoring and community air quality plans and action plans in identified disadvantaged communities.

Coordination is going to be key in organizing our public workshops. We hope to partner with ART as they are working with the Bay Area Regional Health and Inequities Initiative (BARHII) in some workshops that they will be planning in disadvantaged communities.

We are coordinating with the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission on hosting a workshop/round table in Oakland in June to discuss how the three different agencies work in the state and how we can all best incorporate environmental justice into our work.

The big challenge is going to be accessibility. We are hoping that we can work with community organizations to identify best locations, best dates, times, amenities, if we need translation services and how that might look.

One of our big focuses is going to be designing these workshops and also understanding our limitations and the fact that we can't solve all of the environmental justice issues in the Bay

Area. We have limited authority through the Bay Plan and being up front about what we can and cannot address and perhaps addressing any past failings with permit approvals or enforcement. We haven't gone too specifically into that.

The other thing that we hope to do is to develop surveys and I included some potential survey questions in the memo. We hope that these surveys will have two purposes; one, to have the public help us scope the problem and then two, to assess solutions. We hope that this will be a way to reach people who may not be able to come to workshops or can be distributed through some of the organizations that we have developed relationships with and also these surveys could be retailored for public processes and we could do things like sticker voting or drawings or other ways to express peoples' feelings and opinions on what the issues are and how to solve them.

This is our last set of questions. Do you think this is achievable? Do you think we are reaching too far? Are there other limitations we haven't thought of? Are we not reaching far enough? Are there any other partnerships that we could undertake? Perhaps local government may be good for us to partner with especially when they are implementing environmental justice into their general plans. How does this fit into our long-term plans of community engagement? Can this process inform some of our needs in terms of community engagement?

Mr. Goldbeck commented: We recognize that BCDC funding for some of these engagement activities is a tool. We have considered this and thought about what we could do. The problem is we can't do much because BCDC does not have much money. There are also state limitations such as we can't provide food and such. The times that we have done it we have done it out of our own pockets.

That is a difficult thing for us. We recognize that it would be important to do that but currently we are not able to do that.

Commissioner Showalter had questions: How many workshops are we thinking of doing?

Ms. Bennett replied: That is a question we haven't addressed yet.

Commissioner Showalter continued: If you look at this map, it looks like there are seven blobs of area. This is something that we really need to think about first because that changes things.

In the South Bay you should contact the Alviso Working Group. They are super organized and they will be one end of the scale of stakeholders involved in this.

We were doing some transportation planning a couple of years ago for a ballot measure and there was a non-profit called, Connect the Dots that is run by Debbie Mitel. Since they are not a state agency Connect the Dots can provide food and other things. Connect the Dots put on the workshop and provided some food and other things and maybe we can have an opportunity for something like that with a local group.

Mr. Goldbeck agreed: that would be great and that is one of the strategies that we have had is to partner up with local folks so we don't have the fatigue of people coming repeatedly from various agencies hitting the same topics but also maybe some of the non-government folks can provide some of these enticements to participate.

It would be great if there were some group that wanted to provide these things for us. We will look into that.

Commissioner Showalter commented: We really need to give some thought to, why would a specific group want to come to this kind of a workshop? What is our hook for them? There are different hooks for local governments and different hooks for local government planners and different hooks for communities.

You have obviously given a great deal of thought to this but in the individual workshop planning you really need to assess that out. And they will be different for different workshops.

The strategy should be, having a couple of independent workshops that are just for this and then going and giving talks at existing meetings which you have in here. I think that is a really good idea. Aligning with ongoing activities that like-missioned agencies are doing is advantageous.

We really need to give some serious thought about, in these communities why would somebody want to come to our meeting?

Ms. Fiala commented: We are hoping to address that issue of, why would anyone care about these meetings. Some questions like, what is your relationship to the Bay, how could that relationship be better or what are some of the problems that your community is experiencing relative to the Bay and we can try to scope the problem collectively before we dive into crafting solutions.

Commissioner Showalter agreed: Yes. And there are so many things that connect to that, particularly, like the vulnerability with flooding and rising tides and that is huge. And also the public access is important. For communities with fewer resources; the public parks are wonderful for all of us but for people who don't have much money having access to public parks is really important.

Ms. Klein commented: I just thought of the East Bay Regional Park District which may have done engagement and be able to share ideas with us. I wonder if when we go to these communities for talks, workshops or education if we could connect some of the BCDC projects with public access resources in those communities and kind of showcase them and also ask how these particular amenities are serving their needs and what else you might want that we could support you on in a regulatory sense.

Mr. Goldbeck commented: That's great. It's good to give them an example of the work we have done in their community because nobody is going to know who we are and what can and can't do. That is part of being transparent in making people understand the areas we do get involved in such as public access but also understand that we have a lot of limitations so we can't fix all of the past wrongs of government.

I like being able to give each respective community examples of work we have completed that benefits them.

Commissioner Pemberton commented: I agree with the sentiment of figuring out our goals and why people will care about what we are doing and want to come before we just kind of dive in and start trying to arrange a workshop. I agree with the focus on transparency and being collaborative and thoughtful.

As you mentioned, we have been excited about this idea at State Lands of also working with BCDC and the Coastal Commission staff and other agencies who are trying to also weave environmental justice concerns and issues into our work and maybe that is a way for communities to feel like it's easier to contribute and participate because we are making ourselves available together.

Ms. Klein continued: I had two other ideas. Maybe in addition to looking up some particular projects we could also talk about the types of uses of the public access areas that we generally promote in the public access areas and find out whether those are a complete list of types of uses would want to make as public access such as fishing, swimming, viewing, walking et cetera – what are we missing? Were there amenities in the past that have gone away? I have noticed that the types of amenities that we have provided for fishing have decreased.

I was also wondering if the Water Trail is considering environmental justice. Matthew do you know? Does that come up on any of your projects?

Enforcement analyst Matthew Trujillo replied: There is often presentations made by organizations that engage with vulnerable communities.

Ms. Bennett continued: We are having a more in-depth conversation with the Coastal Conservancy who does the Explore the Coast grants to get folks involved. Their goal is to bring people that have limited access to the coast to the shoreline and one of the ways they are doing it is through outreach in the Bay Area.

Ms. Klein asked: Should we then also engage with the school districts in the vulnerable communities?

Ms. Fiala answered: I hadn't thought of that. It could be done.

Ms. Klein continued: We could look for organizations that are willing to subsidize activities to get the kids on the water. There is a group called, Environmental Travelling Companions and maybe it would be a good line of thinking to partner with organizations that want to do good and have a particular focus and help them direct funds to Bay-related outings.

Commissioner Showalter added: I also think down the line as we develop the Bay Trail and the Water Trail, particularly in the South Bay, there is a lot of opportunity for small commercial ventures. These would be good businesses for people. This might be particularly good in a disadvantaged community.

Ms. Klein asked: How did you develop this list of organizations to outreach to?

Ms. Bennett explained: A lot of different ways were used. Some of the organizations are ones that the ART Program has worked with and some are organizations that are well known for being involved in other environmental justice processes, some were involved in Policies for a Rising Bay, some were organizations that other state agencies are working with and some are organizations that I found. Some of the agencies are informing and consulting on the Resilient by Design process. A lot of different sources were used.

Permit Analyst Walt Deppe commented: I was going to ask if you have thought about sharing this list with the people on this list so see if they have other ideas of people that might be listed?

Ms. Fiala continued: We can talk about next steps. We are hoping to have a meeting in June. There are two things going on in the state that relate to our activities. There is an environmental justice focus commission workshop and then also in the morning there is Financing the Future workshop in June.

Mr. Goldbeck added: There is a good chance we will not have the July meeting.

Ms. Bennett replied: We talked about having it maybe at the July 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Goldbeck continued: We don't want to miss too many meetings. I definitely think we should have a July meeting.

At the last meeting we talked about the maps of the environmental justice communities. All the agencies have tried to map it but have different maps. This shows the different maps and you can see that there is a lot confluence when you see that they overlap but there are also some differences.

There is a lot of concern in the region that because we are relatively affluent in comparison to the rest of the state that a lot of our communities seem to fall below and were not getting the funds.

These maps do capture a lot of the areas that we agree on. There are reasons for the differences because part of what we are going at is a little bit different from the various agencies but it is good to be cognizant of that.

**5. Adjournment.** There being no further business, Chair Alvarado adjourned the meeting at 12:21 p.m.